



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/530,152

07/01/2005

Ashish Dhar Diwan

WALS-104

9665

23290 7590 11/15/2010
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

LARYEA, LAWRENCE N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3768

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/15/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/530,152	Applicant(s) DIWAN, ASHISH DHAR	
	Examiner LAWRENCE N. LARYEA	Art Unit 3768	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 34-50, 52-61 and 65-70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33, 51 and 62-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :
07/01/2005,11/28/2008,03/30/2009, 11/12/2009,10/22/210.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group II, **Claims 34-50, 52-61 and 65-70** in the reply filed on 10/22/2010 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) "that there is a technical relationship among the recited inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features, with the expression "special technical features" meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art."

This is not found persuasive because group I and group II do not share a special technical feature, they do not satisfy the requirement of unity of invention.

2. As stated in previous *Election/Restrictions*,

Group I, Claims 1-33, 51, and 62-64 are drawn a system or method for imaging the interior of a bodily cavity having first and second imaging means, both positionable within the interior, the second means positionable relative to the first, wherein the first image depicts the location of the second imaging means. It is considered that the **first image means depicting the location of the second imaging means comprises the first special technical feature**.

Group II, Claims 34-50, 52-61 and 65-70 are drawn to a system or method for mapping the interior of a bodily cavity comprising a position indication means variably positionable within, a position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means and a processor means that analyses said signal and provides output indicative of location of position indication means relative to position detection means. It is considered that **the processor means that analyses the signal and provides output indicative of location of position indication means relative to position detection means comprises the second special technical feature**.

Art Unit: 3768

3. Further, there is no requirement needed of position indication means configured with a processor means in Group I. An indication mean configured with a processor means do not depict the location of the second imaging means in Group II. In addition, the special technical feature of Group I is shown in the prior art (US Patent 6,066,090, see prior art rejection set forth below).

Status of Claims

4. Claims 1-70 are pending, claims 34-50,52-61 and 65-70 have been withdrawn from consideration, and claims 1-33,51 and 62-64 are currently under consideration for patentability under 37 CFR 1.104.

Specification

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Art Unit: 3768

6. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" should be avoided in the Abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The information disclosure statement filed 7/1/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the foreign patent documents listed in IDS dated 7/1/2005 have not been considered since the copies of the foreign patent documents, EP 211783, WO 93/20742, WO 96/39916 AND DE 19800765 listed in the IDS were not submitted.

35 USC § 112, Sixth Paragraph

8. The following is a quotation of sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof.

9. Applicant's recitations of the following means-plus-function limitations have invoked the special claim interpretation provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph:

Claims 1 and 62 recite the limitations "a first imaging means for producing a first image" and "at least a second imaging means for producing a second image", however

Art Unit: 3768

these limitations before "positionable within and" appear to positively recite add limitations between "means" and "for", thus the claims do properly invoke 35 U.S.S 112, sixth paragraph (MPEP 2181-2186).

For "a first imaging means for producing a first image" and "at least a second imaging means for producing a second image", the specification (p3, line 24-p4, line 4) discloses the following:

In yet another embodiment of the first aspect, the first imaging means is a camera, and more preferably the camera is a video camera. Preferably the second imaging means is a camera, and more preferably the camera is a video camera. In each case, the camera can be an analogue or digital camera.

In yet a further embodiment of the first aspect, the second imaging means is an arthroscope. Preferably the arthroscope includes a flexible elongate portion having a camera positioned thereon that is adapted to be insertable into the cavity, the flexible elongate portion allowing the portion of the periphery of the bodily cavity adjacent to the point of entry of the arthroscope to be viewed and accessed. More preferably, the first imaging means and the second imaging means are positioned on a support member and maintained in a spaced apart relationship relative to each other. Preferably the support member is at least partially insertable within said bodily cavity. Preferably the first imaging means is an arthroscope.

Therefore, "a first imaging means for producing a first image" and "at least a second imaging means for producing a second image", are interpreted as being an analog, digital, or video camera or arthroscope or any equivalent structures in light of the specification for the purpose of examination.

10. In claim 2 recites limitation "display means for displaying first and second images", the specification (p3, line 24-p4, line 4) discloses the following:

In an embodiment of the first aspect, the system further, comprises a display means for displaying said first and second images. Preferably the display means

Art Unit: 3768

comprises a first monitor for said first image and at least a second monitor for said at least second image. Alternatively the display means comprises one monitor that displays said first image and said at least second image. Preferably the system further comprising an illuminating means for illuminating said cavity.

Therefore, "display means for displaying first and second images" is interpreted as being one monitor that displays said first image and said at least second image or any equivalent structures in light of the specification for the purpose of examination.

11. In claim 3 recites limitation "tissue ablation means for ablating tissue in the bodily cavity", the specification (p3, line 21-22) discloses the following:

In a further embodiment of the first aspect, the tissue ablation means is preferably a radio-frequency ablation device or a plasma discharge device.

Therefore, "tissue ablation means for ablating tissue in the bodily cavity" is interpreted as a radio-frequency ablation device or a plasma discharge device or any equivalent structures in light of the specification for the purpose of examination.

12. In claim 20 recites limitation "illuminating means for illuminating cavity", the specification at (p20, lines 26-27) discloses the limitation as following:

... A light source 67 is also included as an illuminating means to allow imaging...

Therefore, "illuminating means" is interpreted as a light source to allowing imaging of cavity or any equivalent structures in light of the specification for the purpose of examination.

As for “position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means” in claim 17, 112, 2nd paragraph rejection should be made since the specification fails to disclose any corresponding structures for the “position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means” in claim 17. See my suggestion of making 112, 2nd paragraph rejection for claim 17:

In claim 17, the means-plus-function limitation of “position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means” is vague and indefinite. As set forth above, claim 17 recites various the means-plus-function limitation of “position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means.” The specification as filed does not set forth specific structures for performing the means-plus-function limitation recited. The limitation of “position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means” lack specific related structures in the specification. See MPEP § 2181 for guidance in determining whether an applicant has complied with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, when 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, is invoked. 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph states that a claim limitation expressed in means-plus-function language “shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure...described in the specification and equivalents thereof.” “If one employs means plus function language in a claim, one must set forth in the specification an adequate disclosure showing what is meant by that language. If an applicant fails to set forth an adequate disclosure, the applicant has in effect failed to particularly point

Art Unit: 3768

out and distinctly claim the invention as required by the second paragraph of section 112." *In re Donaldson Co.*, 16 F.3d 1189, 1195, 29 USPQ2d 1845, 1850 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (*in banc*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. **Claims 17-19, 23-31, 62-64** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the system according to claim 13, further comprising: a **position indication means** variably positionable within said bodily cavity; ...; and a **processor means** that **analyses** said signal and provides an output indicative of the location of the position indication means relative to the position detection means".

Claim 17 recites the limitation "The system according to claim 17, wherein **the position indication means** is a **reflector means** and the position detection means is a **transceiver means** and further wherein said signal is firstly transmitted from said transceiver means and is then reflected by said reflector means back to said transceiver means."

It is unclear whether or not applicant intends to invoke the special claim interpretation provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph with these limitations.

Further, in claim 17, the means-plus-function limitation of “position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means” is vague and indefinite. As set forth above, claim 17 recites various the means-plus-function limitation of “position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means.” The specification as filed does not set forth specific structures for performing the means-plus-function limitation recited. The limitation of “position detection means for receiving a signal from the position indication means” lack specific related structures in the specification. As such, the applicant has in effect failed to particularly point out and distinctly claim to set forth an adequate disclosure of the invention as required by the second paragraph of section 112.” *In re Donaldson Co.*, 16 F.3d 1189, 1195, 29 USPQ2d 1845, 1850 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (*in banc*).

15. Claim 32, line recites the limitation “the nuclear space”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3768

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

17. **Claims 1, 2, 8-11, 15-16, 20-22, 51 and 62** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Yoon (US Patent 6,066,090. May 23, 2000)**.

18. **Re Claim 1: Yoon** teaches a system **(See Fig. 8)** for imaging the interior of a bodily cavity of a patient comprising: a first imaging means positionable within and for producing a first image of said interior; and at least a second imaging means positionable within and for producing a second image of said interior; wherein said second imaging means is movable relative **(See figs 4-8)** to the first imaging means **(44 and 47)** and positionable in a location wherein said first image depicts the location of the second imaging means **(46 and 48)**.

19. **Re Claims 2, 21 and 22: Yoon** teaches a system for imaging the interior of a bodily cavity of a patient further comprising a display means **(150)** which comprises a first monitor **(152)** for said first image and at least a second monitor for said at least second image **(154)**.

20. **Re Claims 8-11: Yoon** teaches a system for imaging the interior of a bodily cavity of a patient, wherein the imaging means is a video camera **(See Col.8, lines 9-25)**.

21. **Re Claims 15-16 and 62: Yoon** teaches an imaging system wherein the first imaging means and the second imaging means are positioned on a support member **(42 43)** and maintained in a spaced apart relationship relative to each other.

22. **Re Claim 20: Yoon** teaches an imaging system further comprising an illuminating means for illuminating said cavity **(See Col.5, lines 3-11)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

24. **Claims 3-6, 23-29 and 63-64** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yoon** in view **Osadchy et al (US Patent 6,368,285 A1, April 9,2002)** .

25. **Yoon** teaches the claimed invention see supra rejection, however **Yoon** do not teach that the imaging system includes an ablating means, a position indication means, position means and mapping means during imaging the interior of the bodily cavity of a patient.

26. **Osadchy et al teach** an imaging system which includes an ablating means **(See entire document particularly, Col. 10, 29-39 and Col. 3, 59-67; Col. 4, 1-67 Col. 7, 1-15)** a position indication means **(28)**, position detection means **(40)** **(See Col.**

Art Unit: 3768

9, 4-22) and mapping means (**See 21,mapping catheter; See Col. 10, 42-50),(See Col. 3, 52-56)** and a computer **(36)** in order to help a user to perform diagnostic and therapeutic functions of an organ during imaging the interior of the bodily cavity of a patient.

27. **Re Claims 26-29: Osadchy et al teach** an imaging system wherein said real image is obtained using an imaging technique selected from the group comprising X-ray imaging, magnetic resonance imaging, and computer tomography imaging.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the imaging system of **Yoon** to include a position indication means, position detection means and mapping means of **Osadchy et al** in order to in order to help a user to perform diagnostic and therapeutic functions of an organ during imaging the interior of the bodily cavity of a patient as taught by **Osadchy et al** .

28. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yoon** in view **Osadchy et al** as applied to claim 3 above, and further view of **Underwood et al (US Pub. 2002/0151885 October 17, 2002)**.

The highlighted claim numbers 1 and 3 should be replaced with "3" as claims 19, 30, and 31 depend from claims 17 and 18.

29. **Yoon** in view of **Osadchy et al** teach the claimed invention see supra rejection, however **Yoon** do not teach that the ablation means is a plasma discharge device.

Art Unit: 3768

30. **Underwood et al** teach an medical cavity probe system ablation means is a plasma discharge device (**See the entire document particularly paragraphs [0052], [0068], [0015], [0062] and [0114]**) to break the molecular bonds of a tissue structure during medical procedures of a bodily cavity of a patient.

31. **Re Claims 32 and 33: Underwood et al** teach an medical cavity probe system wherein said bodily cavity (joint cavity) is the nuclear space of an intervertebral disc (**See paragraphs [0025],[0027],[0011],[0022] and [0028]**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the imaging system of **Yoon** in view of **Osadchy et al** wherein ablation means is a plasma discharge device (**See paragraphs [0052], [0068], [0015], [0062] and [0114]**) to break the molecular bonds of a tissue structure of **Yoon** in view of **Osadchy et al** as taught by **Underwood et al**.

32. **Claims 12-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yoon** as applied to claim 1 above, view of **Watanabe (US Patent 4,590,923 May 27, 1986)**

33. **Yoon** teach the claimed invention see supra rejection and (**See Col.1, lines 13-15 and Col.2, lines 1-16 of Yoon**), however **Yoon** does not expressly teach that imaging means could be arthroscope.

34. **Watanabe** teach a medical probe system arthroscope is a particular form of endoscopy (includes a video camera) which in turn is the art of examining the interior of

Art Unit: 3768

a body cavity or hollow organ (**See the entire document particularly, Col.1, lines 1-5, Abstract and column 1, lines 24-35).**

35. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the medical probe system of **Yoon** wherein imaging means could be arthroscope in order to help a user to examine and treat the interior of a joint during surgical procedures (**Col.1, lines 30-35**) as taught by **Watanabe**.

36. **Claims 17-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yoon** in view of **Watanabe (US Patent 4,590,923 May 27, 1986)** as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view medical probe system **Terwilliger (US Patent 4,756,313 July 12, 1988)**

37. **Yoon** in view of **Watanabe** teach the claimed invention see supra rejection, however **Yoon** in view of **Watanabe** do not expressly teach that the medical probe system includes a processor means that analyses signal and provides an output indicative of the location of the position indication means relative to the position detection means.

38. **Terwilliger** teach a medical probe system medical probe system which includes a processor means (computer) that analyses signal and provides an output indicative of the location of the position indication means (sensor means also a transducer) relative to the position detection means (transducer) to allow multiple imaging at any desired locations. (**See the entire document particularly, claim 1, Col.2, lines 44-46, Col.1, lines 17-31, and Col.1, lines 33-38).**

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the medical probe system of **Yoon in view of Watanabe to include** a processor means that analyses signal and provides an output indicative of the location of the position indication means relative to the position detection means (**See Col.1, lines 55-56**) as taught by **Terwilliger**.

39. Claims 19, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yoon in view of Watanabe (US Patent 4,590,923 May 27, 1986)** and **Terwilliger (US Patent 4,756,313 July 12, 1988)** as applied to claims 17 and 18 above **and further view of Snyder (US Patent 4,757,821 A1, July 19,1988)**.

40. Yoon, Watanabe and Terwilliger teach the claimed invention see supra rejection including position indication means (**transducer**) , however **Yoon, Watanabe and Terwilliger** do not teach that the imaging system includes a reflector.

41. Snyder teaches an medical cavity probe system which includes a reflector member configured with transmitter and receiver member to facilitate continuous wave operation to determine the velocity in accordance with the Doppler effect to determine the velocity of blood stream flowing in the cavity of a patient (**See Col.10, lines 65-68; Col.11, lines 1-10**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the imaging system of **Yoon, Watanabe and Terwilliger** wherein the position indication means is a reflector means and the position detection means is a transceiver means and further wherein said signal is firstly transmitted from

Art Unit: 3768

said transceiver means and is then reflected by said reflector means back to said transceiver means of **Yoon** in order to determine the velocity in accordance with the Doppler effect to determine the velocity of blood stream flowing in the cavity of a patient as taught by **Snyder** .

42. **Claims 32 and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yoon** in view **Underwood et al (US Pub. 2002/0151885 October 17, 2002)**.

43. **Yoon** teaches the claimed invention see *supra* rejection, however **Yoon** do not teach that the ablation means is a plasma discharge device.

44. **Underwood et al** teach an medical cavity probe system ablation means is a plasma discharge device (**See the entire document particularly paragraphs [0052], [0068], [0015], [0062] and [0114]**) to break the molecular bonds of a tissue structure during medical procedures of a bodily cavity of a patient.

45. **Re Claims 32 and 33: Underwood et al** teach an medical cavity probe system wherein said bodily cavity (joint cavity) is the nuclear space of an intervertebral disc (**See paragraphs [0025],[0027],[0011],[0022] and [0028]**).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the imaging system of **Yoon** wherein ablation means is a plasma discharge device (**See paragraphs [0052], [0068], [0015], [0062] and [0114]**) to break the molecular bonds of a tissue structure of **Yoon** as taught by **Underwood et al**.

Conclusion

46. No claim is allowed.

47. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAWRENCE N. LARYEA whose telephone number is (571)272-9060. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 a.m.-5:30 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LNL

/Unsu Jung/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1641